LABOUR MONTHLY

Founded 1921 Editor: R. Palme Dutt

S. O. DAVIES, M.P.
Signposts — or Windmills?

*

JOAN MAYNARD, J.P.
Change, Not Tinkering

*

ABE MOFFAT
This Trades Union Congress

*

PEACE AND POWER
R. Palme Dutt

*

Other contributors: Kuo Mo-jo - Maurice Dobb
Janet Jagan - Two Youth Marchers

OCTOBER 1961

One Shilling and Sixpence

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

HOME TO ROOST

SOMETIMES EVENTS move with a jet-propulsion swiftness rivalled only by the speed of thought. And never were swift thought and cool action needed more. Look at the first eighteen days of September; the sky blackened with chickens coming home to roost from all quarters. To list them merely is startling enough: the first set of Yankee-stooge Ministers hanged in Turkey; Washington tries a new-style Guatemala against the second largest country of the Western Hemisphere, Brazil, ousting their president for being courteous to Cuba; the victory of the People's Progressive Party in British Guiana underlines the failure of old-style gunboat suppression only eight years ago; Commonwealth finance ministers at Accra unanimously cursing the great Common Market swindle; antagonism in London and Rhodesia as U.S. imperialism hi-jacks Katanga from their Belgian and British rivals; the next act in the collapse of the *ultras'* Central African Federation, whilst their French opposite numbers try a military coup by assassination in France; the gnashing of 'Western' teeth as the Belgrade conference, representing many millions in 'uncommitted' countries, refuse to be 'uncommitted' on the imperialist side; Selwyn Lloyd's proposal to put his Pause on our Wages, whilst the government aims at blandishing trade union leaders into a 'Planning Council'—with the obvious purpose of 'planning' other people's wage cuts; the consequences of the Portsmouth Trades Union Congress, and the unprecedented interference with militant trade unionists here, there and everywhere, unleashed by the expulsion of the electricians. The conclusions to be drawn from any one of these could fill a single month's pages of *Labour Monthly*. But over and above this we have seen the peoples startled into sleeplessness, if not wide-awakefulness, to the immediate need to cope with all the increased war danger, signallised by the Soviet and U.S. resumption of nuclear tests. So in Britain we have seen marches, sitdowns and other demonstrations, with mass arrests, of those opposing suicide weapons and foreign bases here, saying No! to war over Berlin or nuclear weapons in the hands of those unwilling to restrain Nazi revenge-seekers intent on violating the frontiers of our wartime allies. Thousands have had their first taste, touch or sight of British Justice, from the long arm to the hard fist—some of whom had accepted without question its majestic impartiality when used to clobber progressive trade unions.

We have tried to reflect part of this swift march of events, in R.P.D.'s outstanding *Notes;* the questions before the T.U.C. and Labour Party Conferences, considered by S. O. Davies, M.P. (yet another of those spokesmen of the Left whom the right-wing manœuvred to bar from being heard at Blackpool); by Abe Moffat, one of Britain's most respected trade union leaders, attending his last T.U.C. as delegate; by two marchers who demonstrate how active are the young people in their opposition to war. The whole number is meant to help swift thought and cool, determined action. As a *Nottingham* reader remarks: '*L.M.* is a sure cure for mental wobbles, helping one to keep sane in a mad wicked world.' A *Welsh* reader recalls how im-

(Continued on page iii of cover)

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Notes of the Month

PEACE AND POWER

Might and right govern everything in this world; might till right is ready.

Joubert, *Pensées.*

OVERSHADOWING the Labour Party Conference is the supreme question which governs every other in our time—the question of war or peace. All thinking men and women are deeply disturbed over the trend of the present situation. There are sincere and genuine differences over the best way to meet it. This is not surprising; for there is no parallel in human experience to this menace of a world nuclear war and the new problems to which it gives rise. Not even the most impassioned supporter of the latest Executive 'Defence Statement' would dare to pretend that this weary rehash of the old Nato nuclear strategy (with a little very weak apologetic camouflage), Nazi rearmament and nuclear bases in Britain provides an answer; rather, it is a relic of the explosive material lying about which could give rise to a holocaust. Certainly, a majority vote has been arranged for it in advance by methods of manipulation, confusion, trick substitution of documents to win a majority for one and substitute it by another, or plain violation of mandates, which are hardly creditable. But after all the clanking of the voting machine,

CONTENTS

Vol. XLIII OCTOBER · 1961

	Page
NOTES OF THE MONTH: *Peace and Power,* by R.P.D. ...	449
VICTORIOUS IN DEATH, by Kuo Mo-jo	461
SIGNPOSTS—OR WINDMILLS? by S. O. Davies, M.P.	465
CHANGE, NOT TINKERING, by Joan Maynard, J.P.	467
OBITUARY: William Z. Foster, 1881-1961	470
THIS TRADES UNION CONGRESS, by Abe Moffat	471
WE WHO MARCHED, by Tony Ritchie	479
THE YOUNG WELSH MINERS, by Brian Connick	481
BRITISH GUIANA: OUR VICTORY, by Janet Jagan	484
AN EPOCH-MAKING BOOK, by Maurice Dobb	487
TOWARDS DISARMAMENT: Document of the Month	492
ILLUSTRATION: The Lock-out of South Wales Miners, 1873 ...	472-3
Book Reviews: Luther, by John Osborne: *Archibald Robertson;* Selected Stories of Lu Hsun: *Nan Green;* History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union: *Clemens Dutt*	494

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

successfully operated by these devices to reverse the previous relatively democratic majority of Scarborough won against the platform, no one imagines that this 'victory' will solve the international situation. The real problems of war and peace will not be so easily exorcised by conference manipulations. On the morrow of the vote the same spectres will confront us. Witness Berlin. Witness Germany. Witness the new arms race. Witness the resumption of testing. Witness the manifestly completed plans for the full nuclear rearmament of Hitler's generals with their openly expressed aims to expand to the East. We are now confronted with as urgent a situation as after Munich on the eve of Hitler's major war offensive —but under new conditions of military technology which no longer allow easy time to muddle through to the solution. It is necessary for all, also for supporters of the Executive statement, to awaken to this new situation and, in place of mumbling dead formulas about 'Nato collective self-defence', to face the real dangers of the world today and consider seriously what is to be done to meet them.

Rising Tide Against Nuclear War

The demonstrators at Holy Loch and Trafalgar Square on September 16-17 have shown the rising tide of popular protest against nuclear weapons and nuclear war, against Polaris bases and for a peaceful settlement in Berlin. The police actions of the authorities are worthy of the government of Macmillan, Lloyd and Butler. Also at the Labour Party Conference the most active fight needs to be fought, and will be fought, for the Transport Workers' resolution, to free Britain from nuclear strategy and nuclear bases, and for the resolutions against Polaris nuclear submarine bases and against German military bases in Britain. (Who would have dared to predict that it would come to this seven years ago, when the Labour Party Conference was tricked by a switched vote into supporting Nazi rearmament, to its eternal shame, and in violation of every war-time pledge?) All these measures are indispensable immediate elementary measures for the defence of Britain, to save Britain from its present fate as the principal aggressive nuclear base and expendable pawn of the American military alliance, and therefore inevitable target for destruction if Adenauer (or Ehrhardt or Strauss or Brandt) and the Pentagon launch the war they threaten. The fight for these measures is a contribution to peace. The winning of these measures would be a significant contribution to peace. At the same time it is manifest that all these measures, peculiar to

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the situation in Britain, are not in themselves the answer to the wider menace of the international situation or of a world nuclear war which would be likely in the end to spare no country.

Tribute to the Peace Movement

The broad fight against nuclear weapons and for the banning of nuclear weapons, and thereafter, when every proposal for such a ban was blocked by the Western powers, for a ban on nuclear tests as an initial step, has been a contribution to the cause of peace, even though unsuccessful so far. During the past decade and a half it has been pursued with vigour by millions in all countries, not least in this country. The peace movement in this country, the broad campaign for the Stockholm appeal, the subsequent Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament, the subsequent Committee of 100, the British Peace Committee, and innumerable other organisations have commanded the services of men and women of distinction in all walks of life, and of divers political outlooks. These campaigns have received the devotion and sacrifices of scores of thousands of supporters, old and young, and not least of the best and truest-hearted and liveliest of the younger generation, and of considerable sections in the trade union and labour movement, including an honoured minority among trade union leaders. This service has helped to awaken the conscience and the consciousness of millions for the future.

Present Dangers

Nevertheless, magnificent as the movement in Britain for peace and against nuclear war has been, and continues ever growing, it is necessary to face the facts, however painful. We have not yet so far been able in the West to change by one iota the nuclear war policy of the Western Governments: the Nato nuclear war strategy; the extending chain of nuclear bases and military treaties throughout the world to ring the socialist countries; the rearmament of Nazi militarism and refusal to repudiate its openly expansionist aims; the officially proclaimed strategy of using nuclear weapons first. In the socialist countries there has been no such problem; for the demands of the fight for peace have been the official policy of the governments. In the newly independent or 'non-aligned' countries there is overwhelming support for the same demands. Indeed, the disappointment and fury of the Western official commentators over the outcome of the Belgrade Conference has provided a comic

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

spectacle. With unwise anticipation beforehand they all too openly expressed their gleeful hope to find the Conference provide an anti-Soviet platform in the name of the so-called 'Third Force' theory. Instead they found a reaffirmation of the demands of the peace movement and of the socialist countries for peaceful negotiation of all issues in dispute (including Berlin, on which Nehru had already exposed the falsity of the Western powers' spurious 'legal' claims), for the ending of the cold war and for peaceful co-existence; while all the concrete attack was directed specifically against Western imperialism and colonialism, with detailed reference by name to Algeria, Angola, Tunis, Congo, South Africa, Palestine and Cuba.

1914 . . . 1939 . . . 196–?

No. It is not from the new majority in the world that the danger of a new world war arises. The new majority in the world, socialist and newly independent, stands united for peaceful negotiation and peaceful co-existence; for the ending of the cold war and colonialism; for the repudiation of nuclear strategy, destruction of all nuclear weapons and general disarmament; for the liquidation of all military blocs and removal of all foreign military bases and troops of occupation. As in 1914, as in 1939, so today the danger of a new world war arises from the West, from the aggressive circles of Western imperialism, especially from the most aggressive challenging German imperialism, striving for a new division of the world, now in association with the powerful aggressive American imperialism, already extending its strategic network and military bases for a new world war in fifty countries all over the world.

Not Again?

As in 1914, as in 1939, so today the danger of a new world war arises because the peace movement and the popular movement in the West has not yet proved strong enough or united enough to bring down the reactionary governments in their countries or reverse their policies. In 1914 the young international socialist movement was still too weak and unprepared, and was broken into pieces by the betrayal of the right-wing leadership joining up with imperialism. In 1939 there was a nearer possibility of reaching that alliance which could have barred the road to Hitler's war; but the advancing movement in the West was paralysed and stabbed in the back by the still dominant right-wing leadership supporting non-intervention and Munich. Today the danger has arisen anew, on

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

an even greater scale, through the same basic alliance of the imperialist rulers and right-wing Labour leaders (Macmillan-Gaitskell, Adenauer-Brandt, De Gaulle-Mollet) blocking and paralysing the popular movement for peace in the West and backing the most ferocious imperialist anti-Soviet nuclear war policy. Therefore the danger is acute. But this time we have grounds for confidence in a different outcome, because the world is changed.

Why War Is Not Inevitable

Today we declare with confidence that war is not inevitable. Does this mean that the menace of war can be discounted? On the contrary. The menace of a new world war is grave, is especially sharp at the present moment, may return with renewed sharpness, even if the present immediate crisis over Berlin is successfully surmounted. But the menace can be defeated. Why? Because the balance of the world is changed. Because the forces of peace in the world are now stronger than the forces of war. But when we say that the forces of peace in the world are stronger than the forces of war, can we say that that is so in the Western imperialist countries? No. We are far yet from coming near to be able to claim this. The leaders of reaction rule in the West, and even the right-wing leaders of the labour movement, who in any case support their war policy, have not yet been able to replace them. When we say that the forces of peace are stronger today, it is on a world scale. It is because imperialism is no longer all-powerful in the world. It is because the strength of socialism in the modern world, of the socialist third of the world, supported in the cause of peace by the newly independent countries and by those sections working for peace in the imperialist countries, is now able to give pause to the imperialists and their war plans, and thus bring the possibility of victory for the world peace movement.

Changed World

In this alliance for peace, which can now for the first time prevent a new world war, the decisive factor is the strength of socialism in the modern world and the consequent relative weakening of imperialism. It is the strength of socialism, the victory and successful maintenance now for forty-four years of the socialist revolution, the emergence of a world system of socialism, which has thereby made possible the victories of national liberation and emergence of newly independent states since the second world

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

war. Previously every national revolt in every colonial country in Asia or Africa without exception was ruthlessly crushed by imperialism. 1917 brought the first victories of national liberation in Central Asia, and by the example, by the successful stand against all the combined armies of imperialism, kindled the flame of revolt and unconquerable hope and new confidence in all the subject peoples of the world. Today even tiny and weak nations dare defy the imperialists, thanks to the strength of socialism. In place of the endless misery of the nineteenth century and early twentieth centuries of colonial wars of extermination and subjugation, of the superiority of the maxim gun over the assegai, we have Suez, we have Cuba. The new alignment even begins to be partially reflected in the United Nations.

Delays in the West

If today there is hope and confidence that, in spite of all, 1914 and 1939 shall not be repeated, there is no doubt of the decisive reason. It is not—unfortunately—because the labour and peace movement in the West has yet proved able to check their reactionary rulers or reverse their war plans. Despite all efforts, it has not even proved possible to prevent the outrage of Nazi rearmament, against which all the peoples stood pledged a decade and a half ago. The right-wing Labour leaders have once again blocked the popular movement for peace and saved Tory war policy. If it depended only upon the labour and peace movement in the West, the stage would be already set for the new version of 1914 or 1939, for the launching of the war of which the Western General Staffs and press have already boastfully published the blueprints and (while they believed they had atomic superiority) even unwisely forecast the precise date for the conquest and occupation of the socialist world.

Socialist Bastion of Peace

If today these Fulton dreams have vanished, if today there is rational ground for hope that, despite the still grave dangers, there shall not be a new world war, it is because of the strength of socialism. It is because imperialism is no longer all-powerful in the world. It is because the Western imperialists have no longer the monopoly of the weapons of modern science to dictate to the lesser breeds throughout the world in the interests of the Stock Exchanges of London, Paris and New York. It is because socialism has not only the superiority of its social and economic system and rate of

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

development; not only the superiority of the developed political consciousness and classless unity of its peoples, already demonstrated in the second world war, when every other army in Europe went down before the Nazi blitzkrieg; not only the superiority of educational and scientific and technological development, consequent on the social system; but also demonstrable and proven rocket and nuclear superiority, also in the sphere of weapons, which has given pause to the nuclear war dreams of the Western war-makers. The strength of socialism includes as an indispensable element in present conditions this nuclear and rocket weapons equipment and equality and even superiority—until we win disarmament. This is the hard brutal fact of modern world conditions which it is essential for the peace movement to understand. Socialism for peace has held at bay the Western plans for a nuclear war, and may yet, with the co-operation of the peoples of the world, rule out for ever a new world war. In the alliance of the peoples of the world for peace the strength of socialism is the decisive bastion apart from which all else is weak. This is the vital truth which the peace movement in every country needs now to understand. Without this understanding the peace movement in the West would be as weak and ineffective in the storms of today as gossamer in a typhoon.

Honour to Bertrand Russell

When Bertrand Russell went to prison to express his protest against nuclear weapons, his action illuminated the age in which we live, and shamed forever the rulers of Britain. No matter the differences on political tactics. No matter that he mixes Macmillan and Kennedy and Khrushchov in one hat. No matter that he fails to see the difference between the openly proclaimed Western strategy of launching nuclear war first and the battle of socialism, while maintaining defence, to banish nuclear weapons forever. What matters, what stands to his eternal honour is that this veteran hero of eighty-nine years of age, this world renowned philosopher and mathematician, who could have with justice chosen ease and retirement after a life-time of service, who served his first sentence of six months' imprisonment forty-six years ago for his courageous stand against the first world war, should now in his ninetieth year have offered up his frail body to prison again, because he understands with all his wisdom and knowledge the horror which a nuclear war would mean, and because he cares—he cares for human beings and for the future life of humanity.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

But Macmillan Rules in Britain

Bertrand Russell's protest is the voice and conscience of mankind. His example has stirred tens and thousands to emulate him. May it stir hundreds of thousands and draw whole sections hitherto politically unawakened into the fight. Prison is an invaluable political educator, a training college for the real revolution. But once again the brutal facts of life must be faced. Bertrand Russell, who should be in the highest place of honour in Britain, is in a prison cell. Macmillan and Lord Home of Munich rule in Britain. Gaitskell, their pallid counterpart and ally, rules the Labour Party and prepares to celebrate his 'victory' for the Western Nato nuclear strategy and Nazi rearmament at the Conference. This is what we have to change. The fight is a political fight. We have to clean our own stables first, and clear out the snooping Polaris submarines and Nazi troops and G.I.s, or British troops making war in Yemen or Oman, before we start putting on airs to lecture socialists about the fallacy of self-defence.

After Sixteen Years

Sixteen and a half years have passed since the end of the second world war. That would be 1935 by the calendar of the era after the second world war—the year of the Anglo-German Naval Treaty, violating every pledge of German disarmament, and according Germany 100 per cent equality with Britain in submarines, because My Lords of the Admiralty and the Wiseheads of the Tory Cabinet never imagined that those submarines, so admirable for use in the Baltic, would in fact sink British ships and sailors. This time the pace is quicker, as the whole path of technical and military development is quicker. The same solemn oaths for German disarmament ('completely disarmed for fifty years at least', swore Churchill to Stalin at Teheran; and he records in his memoirs how Stalin looked at him with his ironic smile and quietly reminded him of the experience after the first world war, to which Churchill, according to his own record, replied: 'It will be different this time'). The same oaths for the destruction of Nazism and removal of every leading Nazi, for the expropriation of Krupp and Flick and Thyssen and all the great monopolist backers of Hitler. All these oaths have been violated and repudiated by the forsworn and perjured Western rulers even quicker this time—and this time without even the hypocritical Munichite pretence of compulsion through weakness. Already the restored army of German militarism under Hitler's Generals is the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

strongest army in Western Europe, with the Nato machinery to command the weaker 'integrated' divisions of the British and French vassals.

Salute to the German Democratic Republic

Only in the German Democratic Republic have all the war-time pledges of the allies and of Potsdam been honestly fulfilled (with only late building of a volunteer people's army, without conscription as in West Germany, under the compulsion of defence to meet the West German Army; a people's voluntary army under anti-fascist leadership, Hitler's generals excluded from the command). Here, in the stony soil of the traditional century-old home of Prussian Junkerism and militarism, the historic curse of Europe, the very roots of Junkerism, of the landowners and monopolists and militarists and Nazis, have been torn out by the new leadership of the people to build a new socialist order. And all that the louts of Western journalism can do is to cast their stones and sneers at this most valiant leadership in post-war European reconstruction, headed by working-class anti-fascist fighters from the beginning of the German Revolution in 1918, who have undertaken and are successfully carrying forward the most difficult task of any, in the common cause of all the peoples of Europe, here in the very heart and breeding ground of Prussian Junkerism and militarism to rehabilitate this people and lead them to a new socialist way of life.

Nuclear Weapons and the Fight for Peace

Throughout these sixteen years socialism has led the fight for peace, against nuclear weapons and against nuclear strategy. From the outset, from Hiroshima and Nagasaki (when the United States and Britain never dared even to divulge to the Soviet Union their criminal plan) the Soviet Union has brought forward, year after year, its proposal for the banning and destruction of all nuclear weapons. Every time this proposal has been voted down by the Western powers, on a series of ever-changing contradictory pretexts: at one time, on the grounds that this represented a malevolent plan to deprive the West of its key weapon and hand over superiority to Soviet 'conventional' forces; at other times on grounds of difficulties of control and inspection; the contradictory ever-changing grounds revealing only one consistent position, the refusal to abandon nuclear weapons. The Soviet Union proposed right up to 1954 the unification of Germany by free elections under the supervision of

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the United Nations, provided that the resulting united Germany should be neutral and not rearmed, in accordance with the Allies' agreements. The Western powers refused, because they preferred the division of Germany in order to rebuild German militarism, just as Adenauer preferred the division of Germany in order to rebuild the old military strength for future conquest to the East.

Bases and Tests

The Soviet Union proposed the removal of all foreign bases, nuclear or non-nuclear, and withdrawal of all foreign occupying troops. The Western powers refused, for they knew that imperialism rests on armed occupation, and only socialism can count on the support of the peoples, if there is no armed intervention from either side. When the universal demand for a ban on nuclear weapons had been blocked for years by the West, in 1958 the Soviet Union took a new initiative and unilaterally renounced nuclear tests and urged an international ban on them. After some delay the West responded for a short time with a parallel renunciation, but then in February 1960 resumed nuclear tests through France. When this plan was announced, the Soviet Union warned in January 1960 that any such resumption of tests, breaking the moratorium, would earn the universal condemnation of mankind. No heed was paid to this warning. The nuclear tests from the side of the Western military alliance went forward. After the fourth explosion, on May 15, 1960, the Soviet Union gave official warning that unless the Nato military alliance ceased these nuclear tests through France, the Soviet Union would be compelled also to resume nuclear tests. No heed was paid to this warning, any more than to the previous warning of January 1960. On the contrary, the United States and Britain refused to vote for a resolution in the United Nations appealing to France to desist from nuclear tests. Thus fifteen months' warning, with ample time to retrieve the situation, was given before the final resumption, which the Western press affected to treat as a bolt from the blue without previous warning. It was only after fifteen months, in face of the serious worsening of the international situation, in face of the Western extreme semi-mobilisation military measures and open aggressive threats of nuclear war in the event of a Soviet peace treaty with the German Democratic Republic, that the Soviet Union took the grave decision, announced on August 31, 1961, of opening a new series of nuclear tests, including new types of weapons and a 100 megaton bomb, as

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a precautionary measure of defence against the threats of nuclear war and to 'cool the hotheads' who were so noisily proclaiming their plans for a nuclear war over Berlin.

Grave Warning

This grave announcement and decision could only cause deep pain and sorrow to all the peoples of the world, and not least to the Soviet people, who know most what war means, and who have striven so valiantly in the forefront through all these years for the banning and destruction of all nuclear weapons. If the Soviet leaders, who hate nuclear weapons, who have fought in the forefront for their abolition, who unilaterally led the way in renouncing nuclear tests, and who have the proven, most profound military experience and judgment of any leadership in the world, found this decision now necessary in the cause of peace, in the cause of preventing a nuclear war, then this is the most urgent warning, to the peoples of the whole world, and to the peace movement of the whole world, of the seriousness of the international situation. Above all, it is a warning to the peace movement in the Western countries and to the peoples of the West; because, as the statement makes clear, it is precisely the failure (not in the sense of criticism of those engaged in the effort, who have worked hard to win a change, but as a statement of fact) of the peace movement and the peoples of the West to change the policies of their governments, to change the Nato nuclear war strategy. Nazi rearmament, Polaris bases or the official strike-first nuclear directive, which bears the main responsibility for compelling this 'reluctant' Soviet decision, made 'with a heavy heart', 'with regret'. We may still hope that it may be possible, if circumstances permit, to advance anew to an international ending of tests (this time completely on both sides), pending the only real solution, general and complete disarmament.

Lesson for the Peace Movement

There is here a most significant and positive lesson especially for the whole peace movement in Britain, since it is in Britain above all that the most active movement against nuclear weapons in the countries of the Western military alliance has developed. Sometimes a few of the advocates of what is loosely termed 'unilateralism' for Britain (the necessary liberation of Britain from Nato nuclear strategy and bases) believe that on the basis of this advocacy they can adopt a kind of attitude of moral superiority to what they

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

call 'the nuclear powers', without distinction between the difference of attitude of socialism and imperialism to the banning of nuclear weapons. Such an attitude is unbecoming from the inhabitants of the pirate's nest, from which the nuclear submarines speed out to the shores of the Soviet Union with sixteen nuclear bombs on each and public boasting of their capacity to blast the towns and cities of the Soviet Union out of existence in two minutes. If we had established socialism in Britain, and the United States sent out such nuclear submarines all round our coasts with American press boasting of their capacity to blast out of existence Red London and Red Manchester and Red Glasgow in two minutes, we should probably have small respect for a resolution from a public meeting in U.S.A. protesting at our preparing necessary weapons to meet this menace.

A Salutary Shock

The men and women of the peace movement in Britain, the members of the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament or the Committee of 100 or the British Peace Committee or the other organisations are good people, among the best of all that is progressive in Britain. They pass good resolutions. They advocate good policies to the people. They have shown their readiness to go to prison—an invaluable qualification for political activity. But they have not yet had the slightest effect so far on the policy of the Government, of Macmillan and Home and the Imperial General Staff or even Gaitskell. They are not Britain in the world of states. The Soviet Union has to live in the real world. The Soviet Union cannot live in the world of resolutions. The Soviet Union has to deal with the Britain of Macmillan, the France of De Gaulle, the West Germany of Adenauer or Brandt, the United States of Kennedy and the C.I.A. and the Pentagon. If the future depended on the good intentions and the good resolutions of the C.N.D. and the Committee of 100 to save mankind from a nuclear war, the hopes for mankind would be frail indeed. But if the Soviet decision to test nuclear weapons or rockets of a new type, 100 megaton bombs or anti-missile missiles or whatever it may be, capable of blasting out of existence the supposed invulnerable 'hardened' I.C.B.M. missile sites or Polaris submarines, compels the Pentagon and West German General Staff to think again before going on with their proclaimed plans to launch a 'limited' nuclear war over Berlin or Germany (which would inevitably become a world nuclear war, for there is no such 'limitation')—then this decision of the Soviet Union, however painful,

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

however costly also in some immediate harmful physical effects, may in fact have saved mankind from the horrors of a world nuclear war. And it may speed the basic aim of general and complete disarmament. Of course the decision has given a shock to all sections of the peace movement. But it may yet prove a salutary shock if it helps the learning of this lesson, the awakening to a stronger understanding of the real world, and above all the urgency and our special responsibilities here in Britain.

September 18, 1961. R.P.D.

VICTORIOUS IN DEATH

Kuo Mo-jo

[*We mark the occasion of the twelfth anniversary of the victorious Chinese Revolution by printing a remarkable poem breathing the very spirit of internationalism. Written forty-one years ago, it illustrates how long-standing is the bond between the peoples seeking national liberation in the East and West. Today chairman of the Chinese Peace Committee, in 1920 Kuo Mo-jo was moved to write this poem about a hero of the Irish people's struggle; in it he quoted from two of Britain's traditional poets of liberty.—Ed.*, L.M.]

Terence McSwiney, the Sinn Feiner, a leader of the Irish Republican Army, was arrested by the British Government in the middle of August, 1920, and imprisoned in Brixton Gaol. For seventy-three days he disdained to eat the English bread and died there on October 25, 1920. In these four stanzas written by me at that time were crystallised the hot tears shed by me during those days. At the head of each stanza are lines quoted from *The Downfall of Poland* by the Scottish poet, Thomas Campbell (1777-1844). They may be read in conjunction with 'The Glory That Was Greece' from *Don Juan,* and 'Fair Greece! Sad Relic' from *Childe Harold's Pilgrimage* by Byron. Byron fought for an independent Greece; the struggle ended in defeat in which Byron died. Campbell gave money many times to aid Poland. The two poets rival each other in nobility of spirit. Poland and Greece are now reborn, and Byron and Campbell are no longer living; but there is a second Poland in the West and a second Greece in the East. May the spirit of Byron and Campbell 'Once again to Freedom's cause return'!

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

I

Oh! Once again to Freedom's cause return,
The patriot Tell—the Bruce of Bannockburn!
True depiction of 'the sea of tears',
gaunt forbidding pile: can it be the gateway to a prison, or the outside of a church?
A countless throng of young men kneel at prayer.
'McSwiney, leader of the Irish Republican Army,
cast into Brixton gaol fifty days ago and more,
has spurned ever since the shameful English bread.
We sons of Ireland, kneeling before this great building,
are deeply moved by his devotion.
We offer up our prayers for his protection'.
Honoured McSwiney!
Dear sons of Ireland,
the spirit of freedom will ever stand by you,
for you stand by one another,
you are the incarnation of freedom!

October 13

II

Hope, for a season, bade the world farewell,
And Freedom shrieked—as Kosciusko fell!
Terence McSwiney, Irish patriot!
Today is the Twenty Second of October!
(Never has the calendar on the wall so fixed my attention!)
Are you still alive, locked in your prison cell?
Came a cable of the Seventeenth from London:
It was sixty-six days since your fast began,
and yet you bear yourself as well as ever.
You talked for a while with your dear ones on the afternoon of the Seventeenth,
and your face was even more radiant than before.
Your strength was failing daily . . .
and today is the Twenty Second of October.
Irish patriot, Terence McSwiney!
Can you still be counted among living creatures?
A cable of the seventeenth from your native Cork
told that a Sinn Feiner, comrade of yours, Fitzgerald,
fasted for sixty-eight days in Cork City Gaol,
and suddenly died at sundown on the Seventeenth.
Cruel deaths there are in history, but few so tragic.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Shouyang Mountain of Ireland! The Po-yi and Shu-chi of Ireland!*
The next cable I dread to read. . .

October 22

III

O sacred Truth! Thy triumph ceased a while,
And Hope, thy sister, ceased with thee to smile.
Now arrives a cable of the Twenty First
Three times McSwiney has fainted.
His sister has sent a telegram to his friends
Hoping that the citizens have offered prayers for her brother.
She prays that he may die the sooner, and his agony be ended.
Who could bear to read to the end these heart-breaking words? Who could restrain his tears?
Bestial murderous government, are you bent on casting an indelible stain on the history of the world?
Cruel, callous Englishmen, has the blood of Byron and Campbell ceased to flow in your veins?
Lustreless moon, would that our sombre earth might on the instant be turned like you to ice!

October 24

IV

Truth shall restore the light by Nature given,
And, like Prometheus, bring the fire of Heaven!
The mighty ocean is sobbing its sad lament,
the boundless abyss of the sky is red with weeping,
far, far away the sun has sunk in the west.
Brave, tragic death! Death in a blaze of glory! Triumphal procession of a victor! Victorious death!
Impartial God of Death! I am grateful to you! You have saved the McSwiney for whom my love and reverence know no bounds!
McSwiney, fighter for freedom, you have shown how great can be the power of the human will!
I am grateful to you, I extol you ; freedom can henceforth never die!
The night has closed down on us, but how bright is the moon. . .

October 27

*Po-Yi and Shu-chi were two lords of the Shang dynasty (16th-11th century B.C.). When Chou overthrew the Shang dynasty, they disdained to eat the food of Chou, hid themselves on Shou-Yang Mountain and lived on wild herbs. Subsequently they died of hunger.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

RIGHT-WING LABOUR, its Theory and Practice

Emile Burns

Showing the nature of various lines of "new thinking", and where they lead

7s. 6d.

AFRICA: the Lion Awakes

Jack Woddis

The companion volume to *Africa: the Roots of Revolt;* dealing with the progress of the movement for national independence throughout Africa

21s.

Coming shortly—

THE RULING CLASS, a Study of British Finance Capital

S. Aaronovitch

The author of *Monopoly* traces the fusion of industry and finance, and analyses the main groupings of economic power in Britain

12s. 6d.

TEN DAYS THAT SHOOK THE WORLD

John Reed

The world-famous eye-witness account of the Russian Revolution; the book has long been out of print in this country

15s.

THE BIG SELL

Judith Todd

A review of the mass media (Press, cinema, radio, television, advertising) – for those who want to understand all but not to forgive all

5s.

LAWRENCE & WISHART

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

SIGNPOSTS—OR WINDMILLS?

S. O. Davies, M.P.

[*Last month we opened our columns to discussion of the Labour Party programme,* Signposts for the Sixties, *by Sydney Silverman, M.P. Below we print contributions from S. O. Davies, M.P. for the Welsh mining constituency of Merthyr Tydfil, and from Joan Maynard, J.P. and county councillor in the rural area of the North Riding of Yorkshire.—Ed.*, L.M.]

TO the accompaniment of reports from the Trades Union Congress I re-read this thought-provoking official pamphlet of the Labour Party. The speeches of some of the principal spokesmen of the T.U.C. General Council, particularly Messrs. Douglass and Woodcock, made it impossible to be other than profoundly critical of this statement of the Labour Party. The most kindly view possible of these T.U.C. speeches would be not to regard them as signposts of the future, but as tilting at imaginary windmills in an equally imaginary world.

Mr. Harry Douglass talks of 'a Conservative Chancellor carrying out Socialist policies'; and 'if this Government does not listen to us and the T.U.C., I hope it will listen to the chairmen of companies'. What a conception of the state of things prevailing these days, and what an appreciation of the disgusting practices and manœuvres of this Tory Government! What confidence can Socialists have in such people, who crowned their disastrous week's work by driving out of our movement nearly a quarter of a million members of one of the most militant and most successful trade unions in the country.

But back to the pamphlet. It highlights the following five themes:

(*a*) Planning and economic expansion;
(*b*) the use of our land;
(*c*) a new approach to social security;
(*d*) equality of educational opportunity; and
(*e*) fair taxation.

The pamphlet rightly reminds us that 'we live in a scientific revolution', and warns us of 'the dangers of complacency', and of 'piecemeal deterioration'. We further agree that 'the economy is still dominated by a small ruling class'; that 'one per cent of the population own nearly one half of the nation's private wealth and property';

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and that in 1959 'over £6,000 millions were made in untaxed capital gains'. It expresses grave concern at the growth of large-scale organisations in industry; and asks how 'the handful of men who control these great concentrations of power can be made responsive and responsible to the nation'. And: 'take-over follows take-over in bewildering fashion—British firms swallow each other and are then swallowed by American'.

Up to this point the pamphlet correctly reveals to us much of the anatomy of present-day British capitalist economy; an economy we are told characterised by 'private affluence and public squalor'. But, I regret to say, that it does not tell us how the Labour movement could bring to an end such a society which is dominated by a small minority, controlling the economy and dictating at its pleasure the policies of Tory Governments. To talk of co-operation with the British ruling class is not only sheer superstition but a deliberate refusal to accept the logic of the class war waged by this powerful minority with its obsequious Tory politicians. It is no use pretending that we can meet the modest demands of this pamphlet in an economy hurtling from one crisis to another, and at a time when £1,600 millions are squandered on futile and suicidal armaments, or by making gifts of many, many millions of pounds a year to financial jugglers, or by pretending that Labour politicians could run the capitalist economy better than its traditional devotees, or by ganging up with other reactionary governments in conspiring against the working classes within the so-called European Common Market.

The pamphlet's very first sentence tells us that we live in a scientific revolution. But neither this or any other capitalist country is fully exploiting the vast creative potentialities of this scientific revolution in the interests of peace and of raising the standards of life of their people. This, however, is being increasingly done in those countries where the profiteer and financial gambler have been eliminated. Why, one may ask, become the hostage of the Common Market and the U.S. conspiracy, largely ignoring the tremendous trading possibilities with the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries of Eastern Europe, with China and the tens of millions of those people who are so splendidly freeing themselves from the slavery of colonialism?

What stark lunacy it is to dispose of all this by spluttering the words 'communism' and 'communist subversion', and then pretend to exorcise the consequent horror by babbling 'The Free World'—The Free World of Nato, of Seato, of Cento, that is, of military bases

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the world over; of the appalling poverty of South Korea and Taiwan, of fascist Portugal and the fascist Dominican Republic (until Trujillo was recently eliminated), of de Gaulle's Algeria, yes, and of de Gaulle's France, where workers' representation was weakened by corrupting and rigging the electoral laws.

One inspiring signpost for the sixties would be to cut out all this humbug and to accept the obvious: that the world is changing and nothing can be done about it. No force, whether military or otherwise, can halt this historical process; an inexorable fact that neither the British Tories, the Pentagon nor the fascist-ridden government of West Germany can ever accept. Another signpost would be to show our determination to direct our social and economic policies towards peace with the peoples of the world—co-existence and not annihilation. To this end all industries, materials and services devoted to armament production to be nationalised immediately Labour becomes the government; all nuclear bombs this country may possess destroyed, and all foreign bases here closed; Britain to withdraw from all power blocks and extend the hand of friendship to all the nations of the world; a more rigid control of the banks and financial houses. These and other constructive plans that could be mentioned in Labour's determination to transform this Britain of ours into a socialist country.

Such are some of the Signposts that would attract to the Labour movement very many of our bewildered and confused young men and women. Peace and friendship will be the drive and inspiration to the movement. To this there is no alternative, save the disintegration of a movement that failed to respond to the call of the hour.

CHANGE, NOT TINKERING

Joan Maynard, J.P.

Yorkshire County Councillor

THIS new policy statement to be presented to the Labour Party Conference deals with five issues: planning and economic expansion, the use of our land, social security, education and taxation.

How can we plan and expand our economy? One cannot plan capitalism, and one can only expand a capitalist economy insofar

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

as it serves the profit motive, the motivating force of capitalism. As a socialist I want to change the basis of our society from capitalism to socialism. The first step to this is as set out in clause 4 of our Constitution 'common ownership of the means of production, distribution and exchange'. In the policy document, however, only one short paragraph is devoted to this vital issue, the role of public ownership, and it says that when the National Research Development Corporation has been 'firmly established, the public sector would be able to advance where it is most needed—at the growing points of the British economy, and in the new industries based on science'.

I think the policy statement should have set out clearly the basic industries we propose to bring under public ownership when the next Labour Government is returned to power; and that having decided on the industries, we should start at once discussing with the trade unions in these industries how best this public ownership can be carried out. I say this because I am anxious to see real public ownership—not the kind of state monopoly we have got at the moment in our nationalised industries. The document points out what is wrong with our present capitalist economy; and then, instead of providing the socialist answer to this problem, it falls back on the suggestion that we can plan capitalism, an impossible task. We cannot begin to build socialism in Britain without real public ownership.

On the use of land and taking building land into public ownership, I am worried by the phrase 'to encourage the willing sale of land'. What will encourage willing sale, except offering an exorbitant price under the present system? Shall we not in fact have to acquire this land compulsorily at the value for present use? I do not think that people who own land will willingly sell except for the maximum profit. They are not concerned with the fact that it is the community who have created the value and it is the community who should therefore benefit. As a member of a local authority who have recently bought a piece of land I know that the individual we bought it off made a cool £18,000 on the deal; these people will not willingly give up their ill-gotten gains.

I like best the educational proposals, for at last we have got round to accepting that the so-called public schools shall be abolished; that there can be no real social and educational equality whilst these schools exist for the favoured few. It is good to read that we challenge as immoral, untrue and a danger to democracy the theory that only a small number of our children are able to benefit from higher

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

education. I am sure that amongst the majority of children there is a great untapped source of ability and I think that this has already been proved in many countries of the world where wider opportunities have been given to every child. Girls, I believe, have the potential to do more jobs in society if they are given equal opportunities with boys. Think how our nation would be enriched by releasing all this ability which is held captive under our present educational system, which like many other branches of our society is more class ridden than in many other countries.

Fairer taxation? of course I am in favour of this; but this will not of itself alter the basis of our society which is at present organised so that the minority can exploit the majority. And so I come back to my first point: as socialists we do not just want to tinker with present-day society; we want to change it to a socialist society. In order to do this we must start at once by bringing under public ownership such things as land—all land—steel, all transport, the building industry, the chemical industry and insurance. Plans to bring these industries under public ownership should be worked out now with the workers in those industries; those plans should then be put to the electorate, explained and argued about. In other words we should take the people completely into our confidence and explain clearly what we propose to do. Nothing is more calculated to put the electorate off than airy-fairy plans and indefinite proposals. As one Labour M.P. once said 'the electorate can always smell a compromise'. How right he was. The average person may not be very articulate but he senses many more things than most politicians give him credit for.

I work and long for the day when we shall put before the electorate a really socialist programme which clearly shows that we believe in the socialist solution to our problems, and why. We can then set out to convince the people that they have the answer to our problems in their hands and that we are their party, ready and willing to help them build socialism in Britain. We need to fire people's imagination if they are to turn out and vote for us. *'Signposts for the Sixties'* is too limited in its outlook. It is limited because the people who wrote it cannot visualise the socialist society we will one day build. Like Frank Cousins, I believe in what is now called 'old-fashioned socialism', I believe in the ordinary people's ability to build this new society; but we must help them by giving them a lead towards the goal. We must not put them off with a very poor second best, proposals to prop up and plan capitalism.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WILLIAM Z. FOSTER

(February 25, 1881—September 1, 1961)

WITH the death of William Z. Foster the world has lost a great working-class leader. Born in Taunton, Massachusetts, of an Irish father and a Scottish mother, from the first day he started work, Foster devoted himself to the struggle of the American workers. From the turn of the century he was already active in the movement—in the heroic days of Big Bill Haywood and the Industrial Workers of the World, Eugene Debs, 'The Rebel Girl' Elizabeth Gurley Flynn, Joe Hill and 'Mother' Ella Reeve Bloor. An apprentice in a type-foundry, later he worked in transport, merchant shipping, building, lumbering and agriculture and metal mining. He joined the Socialist Party in 1900 and became a pioneer in trade union organisation, early tackling non-unionism in the steel works of Pittsburgh and the meat-packing plants of Chicago which he successfully organised in 1917. A great achievement was to organise and lead the first national strike in American history of 365,000 steelworkers in 1919. In 1921 he joined the Communist Party, of which he was Chairman for many years, and became its candidate for the Presidency for the first time in 1924.

Foster was unswerving in opposing all who capitulated to the capitalist ideology of 'American exceptionalism', separation from the world movement and Marxism and Leninism. A superb organiser and propagandist, he also found time to write over a dozen major historical and theoretical works. (He was always a good friend to Labour Monthly, *to which his first contribution was in September, 1922, and his latest in May, 1954.)*

Reviewing his own stormy life on his 70th birthday, he wrote: 'My life in the Labour left-wing and Communist movement has been a very happy one. It has given me the opportunity to do the thing closest to my heart and mind—to fight for progressive socialism. From my earliest youth I have always felt a great pride in being a worker and it has ever been a matter of the deepest satisfaction to me to be able to identify myself so closely with the struggles of the working class. If I were starting my life all over again, I would take the same course as I have done.'

It is a fitting epitaph; his life embodied much of the history of American labour, on which he made an indelible imprint.—Ed., L.M.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THIS TRADES UNION CONGRESS

Abe Moffat

[*Particular interest attaches to this article by an outstanding trade union leader who was attending his last Trades Union Congress as President of the Scottish miners. Retiring from office on reaching the age limit of 65 last month, Abe Moffat has given long years of distinguished service to the British and international working class, both on the executive of the National Union of Mineworkers and on the executive of the Communist Party. We are pleased indeed to be able to print his view of the 1961 T.U.C.—Ed.*, L.M.]

THIS year's Trades Union Congress opened with an agenda containing 90 Resolutions and a statement by the General Secretary showing a total membership of 8,299,393, an increase of 171,142 compared with last year. The National Union of Mineworkers showed the biggest decrease of 53,212, due to the fall in manpower. Immediately following the statement, Congress decided to expel the Electrical Trades Union, and thereby reduced the membership by another one-quarter of a million.

This decision is one of the biggest tragedies in the history of the British trade union movement, and every step must be taken to heal this breach in the interests of trade union unity. No one can deny that the Electrical Trades Union has played a leading part in the fight against wage-freeze and led the fight for many other progressive policies over a number of years. The trade union movement cannot afford to allow such an important trade union to remain outside the ranks of the Trades Union Congress. It is a responsibility of every trade union to take the necessary steps to ensure trade union unity.

Many important resolutions were carried at this Congress on subjects which effect the lives of the people, including pensions, rents, education for youth, housing subsidies and national insurance. Others dealt with foreign firms who fail to carry out trade union customs and practices, the forty-hour week, increased holidays, and for May the first to become a national holiday. In the main, most of the resolutions on economic and social problems from affiliated organisations were accepted; but there was a complete absence of

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Lockout of South

For eleven weeks the coal-owners locked out the miners who refused to
This contemporary drawing shows miners breaking stones on the Brecon

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

es Miners 1873

per cent cut in wages.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

any resolutions dealing with colonial questions and racial discrimination.

The emergency resolution on wages, whilst deploring the Government's attitude to public servants and government workers, had no demand for united action to support the public servants or school teachers who are in the forefront of the fight on wages. There was no mention in the resolution of mobilising the workers behind six million trade unionists who have submitted claims for wage increases. Both spokesmen on behalf of the General Council, Messrs. Douglass (Iron and Steel Confederation) and Woodcock (General Secretary) went out of their way to indicate that their main opposition to the Government's 'Wage Pause' was that they had not been consulted.

On the proposed 'Planning Committee', suggested by the Government, their main opposition was the number and composition of the committees; and a great deal of double talk about planning while concealing the real objective behind the Government's policy of 'planning'—to link up wages with productivity. Both the Government and the British Employers' Federation have made it perfectly clear that they mean planning without control, and to restrict wage claims. As against all this, Congress indicated its response to statements made in the debate, by several delegates who called for industrial action to defeat the Government's policy of wage freeze. This will now be the real test in the immediate future; and the first step should be taken by the whole trade union movement to support the fight of the civil servants and school teachers who are in the forefront of the struggle for increased wages. Every other trade union with a wage claim should be made to understand by its members that there must be no long and protracted negotiations. This can be dealt with most effectively by the utmost unity behind any union involved against the employers, whether it be in public or private enterprise.

On the Common Market the General Council majority, through its spokesman Sir Alan Birch, again showed how they are prepared to support Tory Government policy. They too talked about the big market of six countries with a population of over two hundred million—although we have over two hundred other countries with a population of over two thousand million which is the biggest market of all. We are now told that the Common Market has brought about a social revolution under the leadership of Krupps and Thyssen and the big monopolies in the six countries. We were

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

told it was bringing about European unity, whilst in fact it means quite the opposite; support for Nato and the division of Europe. The General Council, like the Tory Government, talk about conditions before entering the Common Market, as they did two years ago; but there is less chance now of getting any conditions, due to the dominant position of the big monopolies in Western Germany, than there was two years ago.

Behind all the talk is the preparation for making attacks on the workers' standards of living and to engage in fierce competition that can only lead to further economic crises and worsened conditions; this the Belgian workers have already experienced and also the peasants in France and Italy who are demonstrating now against imported agricultural goods from the other six countries. The trade unions should resist this policy of the Tory Government and right-wing trade union leaders; and this should apply more so to the miners, shipbuilders, heavy engineering, agricultural and textile workers, who will no doubt suffer most should Britain enter the Common Market. The position of trade unions should be: extend trade with all countries; increase wages and purchasing power; substantially reduce arms expenditure. This is the only way to overcome the crisis facing British economy.

The most vital discussion at Congress was on the question of peace as contained in a number of resolutions. We had the composite resolution submitted by the Civil Service Clerical Association and the Society of Technical Civil Servants which endorsed the joint statement of the Labour Party and the Trades Union Congress. But the real discussion took place on the three resolutions submitted by the Transport and General Workers, the Tobacco Workers and the National Union of Tailors and Garment Workers. The General Council were against all these three resolutions and supported the composite resolution including the Labour Party-T.U.C. joint statement which gives support to Polaris bases and the training of German troops in Britain. Of course, it should be noted that this is Tory Government policy also.

The most important speeches were made by the supporters of the resolutions calling for an end to nuclear strategy, Polaris bases, and against German troops in Britain. If any one was in doubt about the real feeling of Congress, it was indicated in the tremendous applause given by delegates when it was announced that 4,167,000 votes were cast against German troops in Britain, a majority of 648,000. This was the one defeat given to the General Council on

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the defence policy, but one that should be used by all progressive people to strengthen the fight for peace. The Tobacco Workers' resolution against Polaris, nuclear arms for West Germany and training facilities for West German forces was defeated, but only with the assistance of the Amalgamated Engineering Union, who voted against their own policy—experts at switching votes to assist right-wing and Tory Government policy. Nevertheless, 3,053,000 votes were cast in favour of this resolution and no one can ignore this vote in the future.

The General Council, however, in opposing the resolution submitted by the Transport and General Workers Union, succeeded in changing last year's Congress decision to reject any defence policy based on the threat of the use of strategic or tactical nuclear weapons. This was no doubt the most serious discussion in Congress. The right-wing leadership, supported by the campaign of Gaitskell and company during the last twelve months to change the Scarborough decisions, had also the full support of the Tories, press, television and radio. They have a heavy responsibility on their shoulders for the present international situation, in giving support to this policy of the Tory Government and the reactionaries of Western Europe. However, they cannot ignore the fact that 2,048,000 votes were cast in favour of the T. & G.W.U. resolution, which gives a very strong basis for continuing the fight to prevent Britain being involved in nuclear strategy and for agreement being reached for world disarmament and peaceful co-existence.

The miners, engineers, and rail workers have a special responsibility to change this situation as it is a real tragedy to see these unions, with their record of struggle, having their votes cast for such reactionary policies, in line with Tory Government policy. The first and immediate step to bring this about should be a common struggle by all who desire world peace against the dangerous manœuvres of the West German revenge-seekers, for the conclusion of a German peace treaty and the conversion of West Berlin into a demilitarised free city, as proposed by the Soviet Union.

The only change that took place in the election for the General Council was the defeat of Will Paynter, General Secretary of the National Union of Mineworkers, who polled 3,761,000 votes. There was deep resentment amongst the delegates at this decision and on how the right wing use the machine in voting to discriminate against an outstanding trade union leader and one who tops the poll in the coalfield ballot for the General Council. It is this same General

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Council majority who expel the Electrical Trades Union for rigging ballots, but they themselves are experts in using the machine to get rid of anyone who holds progressive views. As a result of this manœuvring certain people can get elected to the General Council who have not made one contribution in Congress—as we had this year, so far as the miners' representatives are concerned. No one doubts the capability and integrity of Will Paynter; but that does not count with the right-wing leadership. They would prefer to have stooges in preference to a man who has capabilities and who would make a contribution in the interests of trade unionism. The miners themselves have a special responsibility to change this. So long as they continue to nominate three persons for the General Council they are assisting the right wing to keep their own union's general secretary off the General Council. The quicker the miners decide to nominate only two persons for the General Council the better, for only then will they guarantee that their representatives, whoever they may be, will be elected.

Although there has certainly been a set-back in the T.U.C. on defence policy as compared with last year, those who attended the last day of congress would witness the strong desire for peace and friendship with the Soviet Union and for a progressive policy to be carried out by the British T.U.C. This was shown when the General Council narrowly escaped what was virtually a vote of censure against them for their childish decision in rejecting the invitation from the Soviet Union to attend the British Trade Fair in Moscow. On a show of hands the delegates declared the reference back carried, but at the request of the platform a card vote was taken with the result that 3,250,000 voted against the General Council and 3,746,000 voted for them. It was again demonstrated on the resolution submitted by the Musicians' Union on trade union and cultural exchange of delegations. The General Secretary of the T.U.C. was almost on his knees appealing to Congress to leave it as it stood. The delegates declared the resolution carried by a show of hands; again the platform called for a card vote, with the result of 3,783,000 for the resolution and 3,827,000 against. But the General Council majority were defeated in their opposition to the resolution by the Association of Supervisory Staffs, Executives and Technicians on the failure of foreign firms to carry out trade union agreements and customs. Here they seemed to have more concern for foreign firms than for protecting the interests of British trade unionists. On a show of hands they were defeated and on this occasion, due to

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the reaction of the delegates on the two previous questions, the platform refrained from requesting a card vote.

All this goes to prove that the British trade union movement can be won for a progressive policy on home and foreign affairs, providing all progressive trade unionists take the offensive against the policy of right-wing Labour and trade union leaders who are the main supporters of Tory Government policy in the present situation. To achieve this we must strive for the utmost unity in the fight for wages, jobs, and peace. Every trade union should call upon the Trades Union Congress to wage a campaign now in support of the unions fighting for wage increases and against the Government's policy of wage freeze. In place of expelling trade unions, we should demand that the T.U.C. wage a campaign to organise the twelve or fourteen million people who are not in the trade union movement. Above all, we should strengthen the peace forces throughout the country and give organised trade union support to all demonstrations against Polaris and the training of German troops; compel the Tory Government and the right-wing Labour leaders to carry out an independent foreign policy for Britain; remove the shackles of Nato and the West German revenge-seekers; and fight for the banning of all nuclear weapons through complete and general disarmament.

The fight must, and will, go on.

[*In view of the gravity of the issues raised in this very full report of the Trades Union Congress, we have held over further contributions to our series Trade Union Problems in the Sixties until next month.*

Previous contributions to the series included: Will Paynter (Miners), *'The Coal Situation'; F. J. Gore, 'Crisis in Civil Air Transport'; Frank Foulkes, 'Address to the Electricians'; Harry Francis* (Musicians), *'Cultural Exchanges Need Equality'; Ted Hill* (Boilermakers), *'Boilermaker Speaks to Miners'; J. E. Mortimer* (Draughtsmen), *'The Case Against the Common Market'; W. Lindley* (Watermen and Lightermen), *'Are Dockers Decasualised?'; M. McGahey* (Miners), *'Fuel Policy Madness'; Will Whitehead* (Miners), *'Steel and U.S. Coal'; Dick Seabrook* (Shop Assistants), *'Organising the Unorganised'; Dave Bowman* (Railwaymen), *'The T.U.C. Leadership'; W. Ballantine* (Railwaymen), *'Transport: An Exercise in Expediency'; G. Elvin* (Cinetechnicians), *'The Non-Manual Worker'; H. Weaver* (Builders), *'A Case for Nationalisation'; F. S. Winchester* (Vehicle Builders), *'Wages, Work and Organisation'.*]

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WE WHO MARCHED

Tony Ritchie

[This September, twenty-one years now after the Battle of Britain and the Nazi bombardment, has witnessed remarkable demonstrations. Many thousands took part in marches and sitdowns in protests against Polaris, nuclear weapons and the threat of war over Berlin. On September 17 some 12,000 defied a Government ban on the Trafalgar Square sitdown organised by the Committee of 100, headed by 89-year-old Bertrand Russell who was gaoled the previous week. Of the 1,314 arrested, a third refused to pay fines. The day before there were 351 mass arrests at the Scottish sitdown against Polaris. The month of demonstrations opened on September 1 with a Youth March from Coventry to Castlemartin to protest against the German troops being brought to Wales. Typical of the peace demonstrators are these two young industrial workers, who write their account of that march.—Ed., L.M.]

AS we left Coventry on the morning of Sunday, September 3, 1961, unknown to us we had one of the most interesting, and at the same time, most gruelling of weeks ahead of us. We were the seventy young people marching from Coventry to Castlemartin in the far west of Wales, to protest against the arrival of German troops on British soil. Our journey was to take us to Birmingham, Newport, Ebbw Vale, Merthyr Tydfil, Pontypridd, Aberavon, Cardiff, Rhondda, Port Talbot, Tonyrefail, Neath, Swansea, Llanelly and finally, to Castlemartin, where the German troops were installed.

When we left Coventry I felt that this group would be bound to carry out a successful demonstration, and really show the people of Wales that young people are concerned with what is happening in the world today. None of us were over 22, many were around my own age of 16, a few younger; sometimes people said: 'What do you know about war? you're too young to remember'. Well, they were quite correct. Most of us could not remember war; nor do we want to. And that is what we told our critics.

We reached Wales at 11.45 p.m. on Sunday night, very tired from our 106-mile trek from Birmingham; and it was not long before we were well away in dreamland. Next morning we were all up early; and as at every stopping place we had a jolly good meal before we left.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

On Monday evening came one of the highlights of the week. We reached Merthyr Tydfil at 7.30 p.m. and marched about a mile down into the town centre. During that next half hour just about every house we passed must have given us an ovation. When we got to the town hall there was a civic reception waiting for us and an audience with the deputy mayor. And there to welcome us too was that great old man, S. O. Davies, M.P. This welcome I feel added much heart to the marchers; for to hear S. O. Davies speak is an inspiration to anyone. I am sure the other marchers felt like I did, that here was a real father to us all. I am proud to have shaken his hand.

At this stage I must say I think that the people of Wales were generally not only sympathetic, but unitedly behind us. That was natural, for the miners and the whole Labour movement in Wales had backed the cause of the march; and many Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament groups, religious people and women's guilds gave us support too during the march. As we went on, the interest seemed to become more intense, people became more curious about our 'circus'. Everywhere we explained what we thought of the dangers of the rise of German militarism, the Nazi's lot in power, and so on. Sometimes it was really surprising to see how grown-up people had been brainwashed by the capitalist press.

The way we were received in Merthyr, where the whole Labour movement, including the local M.P., joined us; in the Rhondda where the Parc and Dare miners lodge gave us an evening we shall all long remember; in Tonyrefail, where the local council had requested our presence; in Neath, where the wife of the M.P. welcomed us—all this made the marchers feel more clearly that we had a purpose, a mission which had to be completed, come what may. Receptions like this made us really want to take our message to all in Wales, and helped us to endure many more difficult moments throughout the week's campaign.

Here I want to say that two words describe five of our marchers: courage supreme. These were the five members of the Nottingham branch of Woodcraft Folk, average age thirteen and a half, who marched with as much vigour and determination as anyone. I have great admiration for this organisation and such people in it, which makes a real addition to the British Labour movement. I must mention just one girl; thirteen-year-old Terry Peck. She represented the Folk on each occasion and fulfilled all the duties with poise and devotion. I first met her on the Sunday evening at Birmingham,

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

when we laid a wreath at 'Hall of Memory'. Very slight, a freckled face, she went with the delegation, all of whom were much older, with determination, yet relaxed. People like Terry and organisations like the Woodcraft Folk ensure the future of the British Labour movement.

Then there were the young miners who joined us on the way, from Parc and Dare, from Mardy, from Seven Sisters, from Cambrian. Some worked a shift and caught up with us in the evenings. People like these and of course the fine organisation of the Youth Peace Campaign contributed to a really wonderful demonstration. Splendid arrangements for food and accommodation in schools made by Marnie Siggers; the rallying of the marchers by Eiblis O'Shea; the message of greeting from delegates at the Trades Union Congress; and of course the determination of the seventy who went all the way, made the week a great success. The scene at Pembroke Dock was a little disappointing; but I felt really proud on that Saturday afternoon that in spite of considerable intimidation, no marcher either provoked nor retaliated, with those tomatoes nor anything else. I think that made a good impression.

I think the future holds great hope, if we continue our fight against this evil of German militarism. We must never relax until our goal is won. The future is ours. We must take it now; there might not be another chance. We must demonstrate and protest until the danger of German militarism is forever wiped from the face of the earth.

THE YOUNG WELSH MINERS

Brian Connick*

HOW did it come about that the miners' lodge of the Seven Sisters Pit in the Swansea District sent four of us young miners to represent them during the week's trek from Coventry to Castlemartin?

It all really began when the Youth Peace Committee brought out a petition against foreign bases and training of German troops in Britain as soon as this was announced. The petition was sponsored by a number of youth organisations everywhere; in Wales these included the South Wales Youth Advisory Committee of the

*Brian Connick is youth representative on the committee of the Seven Sisters Lodge of The National Union of Mineworkers, and works at Seven Sisters pit. He is 22 years old.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

National Union of Mineworkers. Thousands of petitions were collected and taken to Parliament on January 30, during a national lobby of members of Parliament. My own M.P. agreed and told me that he would speak at any meeting. After this, with other members of the Seven Sisters Branch of the Young Communist League, I went to Pembroke to help distribute leaflets published by the Welsh Communist Party opposing the training of German troops. (The small towns locally depend on the naval dockyard and military establishment.) Our reception at Pembroke then was one of welcome; far more people agreed with us than opposed us.

Next came the formation of the Welsh Campaign Committee Against German Troops in Wales, which called for the formation of local campaign committees. We did this in Seven Sisters; trade unions, chapels, tenants associations, political bodies, as well as many individuals took part.

We were now in the holiday period; I had the opportunity of travelling by car through Western Germany. There I met young Germans, danced, sang and drank with them. Discussing things with them I learned that some believed that they had been better off under Hitler. If so what do the Nazi generals now in command think of when they demand that the Western Powers should help them get their so-called lost land back? I told them that I would welcome any German to stay at my home, welcome them and sing with them; but not whilst they wore jackboots or carried a gun on their back.

When I got home and found the Coventry to Castlemartin protest march had been planned, at first we thought it would be too much to arrange for anyone to go from Seven Sisters. But when four of us young miners went to Pembroke on the Saturday that the advance party of Germans arrived, we saw for ourselves the big campaign which obviously had been laid on. It was a campaign supported by Mr. D. L. Donnelly the Labour M.P., by the local Tories, by the press and War Office. The welcome portrayed by the press was one complete lie. We were so disgusted that we came back and suggested to the Seven Sisters committee that we should represent our lodge on the youth march. This was agreed to; and then we had to overcome the problem of finance, by raffling three dolls, asking individuals for cash and a small donation from the lodge.

Four of us set off with our Seven Sisters Lodge banner for the demonstration at Cardiff on September 1, which we felt was a

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

wonderful start to the week ahead, and then straight on to Coventry, in time for a social evening organised by the Coventry Youth Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament. Next morning, standing there listening to the engineers' leader, Ernie Roberts, and other councillors of Coventry giving us a send-off, we felt proud, holding our Lodge banner high, convinced more than ever that we were giving the lead to the people, by showing that youth wants peace. That was the start of our long journey back to Wales. Wherever we went, wherever we stayed at night, we received not only a welcome, but gratitude as well. We held meetings; we were greeted by M.P.'s, councillors, trade union leaders and local officials. Wonderful meals were laid on by Women's Guilds and other women's organisations. We marched through villages and towns, singing and shouting our slogans, distributing leaflets. Each night we would recall the day's happenings and feel pleased at the end of every day. Of course we met with some jibes and sarcasm: but the welcome always overpowered that. As the week went by we were joined by other young people. What a representative group we were: miners, students, clerks, teachers, beatniks—yes, the lot. (One young lad got the news on the road that he had passed the G.C.E. with six 'O' levels.) When we read local press reports of hostile preparations going on in Pembroke, like fire extinguishers full of red-ink, we laughed; but we knew that we were going to meet with opposition. Saturday came and into Pembroke—television cameras clicking away interviewing local girls, but avoiding us. Some of us had mixed feelings about the reception: after all three months before six of us had handed out leaflets and were welcomed. Now young and old, children and grandparents, were shouting abuse at anyone and everyone. Someone had been working hard!

We left Pembroke feeling very pleased with the turn out from all parts of Britain, and more determined than ever to get rid of the German troops—and those behind them who had obviously succeeded in confusing the people of Pembroke.

Since the demonstration, people back in the valleys who were not so much interested before are now beginning to see daylight and I am convinced that the next steps taken will be twice as high, twice as broad, carrying twice the weight of protest. I am one of many determined to live: I have that right. I am proud to have been on the Youth March from Coventry to Pembroke and associate myself with everyone of them without exception.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BRITISH GUIANA: OUR VICTORY

Janet Jagan*

FOR the third time in the last eight years the People's Progressive Party has won a decisive victory in British Guiana. These elections are significant internationally and for the Caribbean as well as for British Guiana itself.

The P.P.P. was the first stable political party formed in British Guiana. Its objective then was independence; its political philosophy was socialism. From these two goals the party has not swerved. In eleven years it has fought consistently for independence and today stands on the threshold to freedom. In his first words following the recent electoral victory, the party's leader, Dr. Cheddi Jagan, announced that he would now seek immediate independence—at least a year ahead of the time schedule of the Colonial Office.

The Party's first victory of 1953 was short-lived. After four and a half months in office the majority party was kicked out forcibly by British gun boats. The Constitution was suspended and the country was ruled from 1953 to 1957 by an Interim Government appointed by the Governor and a State of Emergency. Party leaders were jailed, interned and restricted, their homes raided, under police surveillance; meetings, processions, books were banned.

In this atmosphere, and during this period, colonial spokesmen were asserting that free elections would not be held until the left-wing section of the Party led by Dr. Cheddi Jagan was eliminated. There were some who swallowed this bait. The then chairman Mr. Forbes Burnham attempted to organise elections within the party to oust the left. This was exposed in time; but the result was that from 1955 to 1957 there were two separate parties in British Guiana calling themselves the P.P.P.; one was led by Mr. Burnham and one by Dr. Jagan. This, of course, precipitated racial antagonism which still divide the country. By 1957, the Colonial Office felt that the Party had been sufficiently weakened and allowed the first elections since the 1953 destruction of democracy. Contrary to all expectations, the P.P.P. led by Dr. Jagan won a majority of seats and

*Janet Jagan is the General Secretary of the People's Progressive Party. In 1953 when the British Government suspended the Constitution, she wrote in the November *L.M.* an article entitled *British Guiana: Our Case*.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

formed the government. Mr. Burnham's group then changed its name to 'People's National Congress'.

During its four years in office the Party was obliged to work under a restricted colonial constitution. The power of its ministers was limited; they faced hostility from a civil service which was frequently unco-operative and a trade union movement dominated by leaders who had participated in the Interim Government of 1953-57.

However, the Party was able to forge ahead and seek solutions to the many problems of an impoverished people. It opened up and distributed 90,000 acres of lands to farmers and farmers' co-operatives. It began to solve drainage and irrigation problems and move to diversification of crops. The new Government opened wide the doors of the country. Trade delegations were received from Canada, U.S.A., West Germany, Hungary, Japan: delegations and visits were sent to Venezuela, Cuba, East Germany, India, etc. A trade deal with Cuba gave rise to a wave of criticism in certain circles. Rural health services were expanded; greater protection was given to workers in newly drafted laws; more teachers and midwives were trained; and new land settlement projects opened.

Despite these achievements, a hostile press worked daily to undermine the party's objectives. A new party, headed by a local industrialist, Mr. Peter D'Aguair, attempted first to conclude a pact with Mr. Burnham to defeat the P.P.P.; after the two failed to reach agreement mainly on the issue of leadership, Mr. D'Aguair formed what was known as the 'United Force'. This party spent close to a million dollars in its campaign to defeat the P.P.P. at the elections—using mainly the bogey of Communism. Vast quantities of U.S. printed propaganda flooded the country; free films were shown throughout the country.

The People's National Congress of Mr. Burnham campaigned mainly on a racial ticket, which eventually wound up in violent attacks on P.P.P. speakers. At one public meeting, Dr. Jagan was attacked so viciously by P.N.C. supporters that he had to have armed protection. The 1961 election campaign was one of the most difficult ever faced by the Party. It was up against bribery and wealth on the one hand and race and violence on the other. Policy issues were obscured in a campaign of hate and vilification. Only the P.P.P. put out a detailed and reasoned policy statement as its election manifesto. Voters were solemnly told that if the Party won, their homes and land would be confiscated, their family life destroyed, their old

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

folks eliminated. Yet the results of the elections were twenty seats for the People's Progressive Party, eleven for Burnham's P.N.C. and four for D'Aguair's United Force. Thus once more, we won majority support, a vote of confidence for four years in office.

This victory means that the P.P.P. will press forward for independence. Although Messrs. Burnham and D'Aguair have paid lip service to the demand for independence, it is significant to recall that Mr. Burnham did not join the call for independence when a British Guiana delegation held talks on the constitutional issues at the Colonial Office in 1960: his attitude then was 'self-government, not independence'. Mr. D'Aguair has always been associated with conservative views, so it was vitally important for the future that the only party to lead the country to independence has been returned to office. And in the Caribbean, the Party's victory has been well received. Politically conscious people in the British West Indies have long been disillusioned with the weak leadership of the Adams, Williams and Manley; they regard the P.P.P. as the only Caribbean political party with a policy, the only socialist movement in the region. Many look to the P.P.P. to give the lead to more vigorous political action in the region.

The question most asked by foreign correspondents is: will the P.P.P. join the East or West bloc? The P.P.P. replies that it will pursue a neutralist policy patterned on that of Ghana and India. It intends to seek aid from any source, provided there are no strings.

The Queen and the Common Market

What will be the position of the Queen if Britain joins the European Common Market? . . . This question is discussed in whispers in Whitehall but never in public.

(*Daily Express*, September 11, 1961.)

To Europe with the Queen. This is something that hardly anyone inside Parliament or outside has yet adequately considered.

(*Sunday Telegraph*, September 10, 1961.)

Our Queen in Europe.

(*Daily Telegraph*, September 12, 1961.)

Readers may be amused to recall that the September *Labour Monthly*, p. 413, discussed in some detail this 'question never before discussed', a fortnight before it was broached in the general press.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

AN EPOCH-MAKING BOOK

Maurice Dobb

[*The publication of a work of high distinction in the realm of pure economic theory is a sufficiently rare event in Britain. We are therefore glad to be able to make available for the benefit of our readers at home and abroad this review by the leading British Marxist economist of this outstanding book* by Piero Sraffa.—Ed.*, L.M.]

IT is a common misunderstanding on the part of so-called 'vulgar Marxism' as well as of critics of Marx that what is important for Marx's theory of value is that actual exchange-values of commodities, or prices, should *equal* values (in the sense of embodied socially necessary labour); whereas in truth what is important to that theory is that exchange-values or prices should be *governed by* values. In other words, conditions of exchange are shown as governed by *conditions of production*. As is well known by any reader of *Capital* who has got as far as Vol. 3, commodities do not exchange (in Marx's theory) at their values but at their *'prices of production'*—save in the quite special case where the composition of capital is uniform in all lines of production (the abstract simplifying assumption of Volume 1).

This has given the so-called 'Transformation Problem' (*i.e.*, transformation of 'values' into 'prices of production') its special importance in post-Marx discussion. It has been pushed into the front of attention for two reasons: (1) because the central criticism of Marx by his foremost critic Böhm-Bawerk was that any such derivation of prices from values (or 'transformation' of one into the other) was logically impossible—this was the 'Great Contradiction' on which he claimed that Marx's system foundered; (2) because Marx never lived to complete his theory of how values were transformed into prices (his own arithmetical examples being incomplete—a fact of which he was quite aware—since only the *products* and *not the means of production* were there translated into price-terms).

For some considerable time it has been known† that this transformation *is* possible (*i.e.*, that prices can be shown to be determined by values) on the basis of production divided into 3 departments or sectors (the third department consisting of luxury-consumer-goods consumed exclusively by capitalists out of surplus-value). Many

**Production of Commodities by Means of Commodities : Prelude to a Critique of Economic Theory*, by Piero Sraffa. Cambridge University Press. 12s. 6d. 100 pp.

†Since this was demonstrated in the early part of the century by an economist called Bortkievicz in Germany—and some years before him, a Russian writer called Dmitriev.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

continued to suppose however that prices of individual commodities *within* each sector could not be determined by the theory—could not be determined, *i.e.*, without bringing in conditions of demand (and thereby opening the door to modern utility-theory-and-all-that). It is only quite recently that it has been demonstrated that the transformation-problem can be solved *for any number of commodities* (and not only for the simplified case of three sectors).

Such a demonstration forms a central part of this work (although, as one should perhaps explain, this is not said in so many words, nor do we meet any explicit reference until we come to the appendix of historical references at the end). Another problem, which this book tackles and which is central to any theory of value and of capital, is this: Commodities are always the product of labour *together with constant capital;* and this constant capital is itself the product of labour *plus* constant capital. As Marx himself pointed out, there is *always* an unresolved residue (*e.g.*, in his criticism of Adam Smith in Vol. 2). How then can the value of constant capital itself be determined in terms of the theory of value? (Special difficulties are involved in the case of the fixed capital element in constant capital: *e.g.*, a machine is not used up in a single act of production; hence only *part* of its own value is transferred to each commodity produced—*how* large or small a part?).

This work starts from the case of 'an extremely simple society which produces just enough to maintain itself'. The commodities produced are also used in production (*i.e.*, they form part of 'productive-consumption'). Labour-power is itself, of course, one of these commodities: i.e. labour-power together with the 'subsistence' that keeps renewing the labour-power used up in work. It is then shown how the necessary exchange-values that must prevail in such a society are uniquely determined by the methods of production. This is shown to be so whether the commodities are two in number (wheat and iron) or *any* number.

This simple case is then complicated in successive stages, first of all by introducing a society which, instead of only maintaining itself, produces a surplus. The same is shown to be true here also: that necessary exchange values are uniquely determined by conditions of production. There is now this difference, however: with a surplus comes a special class of 'luxury products' which are not means of production ('are not used, whether as instruments of production or as articles of subsistence, in the production of others'). 'These products have no part in the determination of the system. Their

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

role is purely passive.' In other words, neither their own conditions of production, nor their destination and use (the 'demand for them'), can affect the values of any other products in the system. This difference between products that do and products that do not serve as means of production the author terms that between 'basics' and 'non-basics' ('the price of a non-basic product depends on the prices of its own means of production, but these do not depend on it').

This surplus may, in a class society, all go as profits (wages consisting of no more than minimum necessary subsistence). Under different social conditions it is conceivable that it could all go as wages, or be divided in various proportions between wages and profits. The author adopts the abstract hypothesis that the surplus is divisible between wages and profits in varying proportions all the way from wages = 0 to wages = 1; and proceeds to show how the prices of individual commodities are affected by this variation. (This is simply a device essentially for showing how prices of individual commodities change as the rate of surplus value changes.) In the case where wages = 1 (whole surplus goes to wages) 'the relative values of commodities are in proportion to . . . the quantity of labour which directly and indirectly has gone to produce them'. However, as wages are reduced from this position and profit emerges, prices begin to diverge from this 'simple rule'. But *they do so in a calculable way*. It is shown that 'the key to the movement of relative prices consequent upon a change in the wage lies in *the inequality of the proportions in which labour and means of production are employed* in the various industries'.

At a later stage it is shown how and in what circumstances the different means of production used can be represented as 'a series of quantities of labour, each with its appropriate "date".' This is called 'Reduction to dated quantities of labour'. The connection between this 'reduction' and the way in which prices (Marx's 'prices of production') of individual commodities change as the rate of profit changes is also demonstrated. In the course of doing so it is incidentally shown that the notion of a 'period of production' which the so-called Austrian School of economists had used as a basis for a Theory of Interest is logically untenable.

A difficulty which had a central place in Ricardo's thought (and is a key to some crucial changes in successive editions of his 'Principles') was that the way that prices changed (and likewise the rate of profit) when wages changed (or the rate of surplus value) varied according to the *standard* in terms of which prices were measured

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(*i.e.*, according to the conditions of production of the commodity selected as standard of value, or as the *money-commodity*). To remove this difficulty, Ricardo tried to define an 'invariable standard of value' which should be an embodiment and measure of 'absolute value'. He never quite succeeded, and ended by doubting whether it was at all possible. Economists ever since have supposed that in seeking it he was following a will o' the wisp.

Marx avoided the difficulty (without, however, solving it) by supposing some kind of 'average' conditions for his standard or money-commodity ('sum of prices=sum of values'). It is a unique contribution of this work that for the first time it shows that such an invariable standard *can* be defined and *how* it is definable. This is called the Standard Commodity (or Standard Composite Commodity). Its characteristic is that 'various commodities are produced in the same proportions as they enter the aggregate means of production'; and no changes in the relation of wages and profits (rate of surplus value) can change the ratio of net product or surplus to means of production. Consequently such a Commodity (or Composite Commodity) is itself invariant to such changes and can be taken as an absolute standard for measuring changes in other prices.

Part II proceeds to develop the analysis in relation to the more complex case of Joint Production—where two or more commodities are produced from the same production-process. It is in this special context that the problem of Fixed Capital, with its special difficulties, is tackled, together with its depreciation with age and the proper rules for calculating this depreciation (*e.g.*, what is the value of a machine at different ages?). The special problem of Land, as non-produced natural resources, and of production under different natural conditions, is then fitted into the picture; and a short concluding Part III deals with changes from one method of production to another as a result of changes in the rate of profit.

The Preface explains that the main ideas in the book had already been formed by the author more than 30 years ago, in the late 1920's. Putting them into final shape, completing special parts that remained unfinished and 'filling gaps' has been the work of the intervening 30 years, during which the author was also engaged on his monumental task of editing his 10-volume edition of the *Works and Correspondence of Ricardo*. The Preface also makes clear (as does the book's sub-title) that the work has been designed as the theoretical basis for a criticism of modern economic theory as a whole. In the author's own words:

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

> It is a peculiar feature of the set of propositions now published that, although they do not enter into any discussion of the marginal theory of value and distribution, they have nevertheless been designed to serve as the basis for a critique of that theory.

We are then promised that 'if the foundation holds, the critique may be attempted later, either by the writer or by someone younger and better equipped for the task'.

One can fervently hope that this promise will be fulfilled—and by the author himself. For it can be confidently said that never in the history of economic theory has so much fundamental and formally refined thought, and of so path-breaking a character, been packed into so slender and elegant a volume. It is a book that will perhaps be misunderstood and remain unappreciated by many more than will understand it; few probably will wholly grasp even the major part of it, though many can and will gain illumination and inspiration from it in part. But it is unlikely that a reader will even begin to see what it is driving at unless he has first of all some acquaintance with and understanding of the early economists and particularly of Marx.

From *LABOUR MONTHLY*

FOURTY YEARS AGO

Every child in a Socialist State would be taught from its earliest understanding to feel a far deeper horror of a social parasite than anyone can now pretend to feel for the outcasts of the Capitalist system. . . Our Capitalist morality is flatly contrary. It does not regard the burden of labor as a debt of honor, but as a disgracefully vulgar necessity which everyone is justified in evading if he can, its ideal of the happy and honorable career being a life freed from all obligation and provided gratuitously with every luxury. In its language, success means success in attaining this condition, and failure a life of labor. This grotesque view is made practicable by the fact that labor is so productive that a laborer can not only pay the debt of his childhood, meet the expenses of his prime, and provide for his old age, but also support other persons in complete unproductiveness. If nine men combine to do this, they can support a tenth in outrageous waste and extravagance ; and the more poorly the nine live, short of disabling themselves as producers, the richer the tenth man will be. All slave systems are founded on this fact, and have for their object the compulsion of nine-tenths of the population to maintain the 'upper ten' by producing as much as possible, and allowing themselves to be despoiled of everything they produce over and above what is needed to support and reproduce themselves on the cheapest scale compatible with their efficiency.

The Dictatorship of the Proletariat, George Bernard Shaw, October, 1921.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Document of the Month

TOWARDS DISARMAMENT

A remarkable international gathering of fifty-five personalities of widely varying views from 20 countries, discussed disarmament and reduction of world tension for three days in London, from September 14-16, 1961. They issued an unanimous statement, which we print in full below, together with the complete list of participants. —Ed., *L.M.*

THE INTERNATIONAL MEETING on disarmament and the reduction of world tensions convened in London from September 14 to 16, 1961, brought together at this critical moment personalities from the United States, the Soviet Union, Great Britain, India and other countries of Europe, Asia and Africa who are united in their desire for a world without nuclear weapons and war. The Meeting declares:

I. Neither the Berlin crisis, constituting an immediate danger of war, nor any other problems, can be resolved by military means. Every local war in the centre of Europe is likely to become a general atomic war. War must be avoided. The United States, the Soviet Union, Great Britain and France should immediately enter into negotiations on Berlin and the German question on a basis of the real situation and with a sincere desire to reach agreement. Military threats and warlike language must be avoided if negotiations are to succeed. We put forward the following suggestions:

1. A statute recognising the independence of West Berlin and free access to the city must be guaranteed on a clearly defined contractual basis by the four States with a U.N. guarantee and a U.N. presence.

2. Sixteen years after the end of the second world war it is now necessary to confirm the fact of the existence of the German Federal Republic and of the German Democratic Republic.

3. The frontiers of Germany (the German Federal Republic and the German Democratic Republic), as provisionally fixed after the second world war, must be recognised as final both by these four States and by the German Federal Republic and the German Democratic Republic, and their inviolability guaranteed.

4. The re-unification of the German Federal Republic and the German Democratic Republic is a matter for decision by the two German States and should not constitute a danger to European security.

5. Any further re-armament of the German Federal Republic and the German Democratic Republic should be stopped immediately and their present armaments must be reduced.

6. There must be no nuclear weapons on the territory of the two German States nor must their soldiers be instructed in the use of these weapons.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

7. The creation of a large zone without nuclear weapons, and its eventual de-militarisation, consisting of the German Federal Republic, the German Democratic Republic, together with Poland and Czechoslovakia, with effective measures of inspection and control, should be guaranteed by the U.S.A., the U.S.S.R., Great Britain, France and the United Nations.

II. The present international crisis has demonstrated all the dangers of an accelerated arms race and has increased the danger of an accidental nuclear war which is desired by none of the atomic powers but is rendered possible by the dynamics of the nuclear war machine.

Only general and complete disarmament can save mankind from war. We accordingly call on the peoples to urge their governments to take immediate steps towards this goal of general and complete disarmament. Disarmament negotiations have been held up in the past by the suspicions on the one side that only partial disarmament or arms control was intended, on the other that serious control of the process would not be permitted.

We accordingly call on all governments for a clear declaration that they stand for a policy of total disarmament and that they will accept appropriate controls at each stage and the gradual development of organs of world security. We call for the rapid completion of such negotiations under the auspices of U.N.O., including the People's Republic of China, and the setting up of an international authority to supervise the rapid execution of the agreed disarmament plan.

The U.N. specialised agencies and other government and non-governmental bodies, such as the trade unions, business circles, religious groups and so on, must be urged to intensify their studies of the relation of disarmament to international and domestic economic relations.

III. We deplore the resumption of nuclear testing and reaffirming our attitude, we oppose war, nuclear weapons and all nuclear testing of any kind, in the atmosphere, underground, under water and in outer space, both as intensifying preparations for nuclear war and as a danger to the health of present and future generations.

We call on the governments now carrying out or planning nuclear tests to halt them immediately, not to resume such testing and to come to an agreement on a permanent and controlled test ban, separately or as part of general disarmament.

The peoples and their governments can still avert a nuclear war, which would be a criminal act, menacing the further existence of mankind and life on our earth. There can be no victory for anybody in a nuclear war.

In spite of our differences of opinion on some of the questions discussed, and aware of our responsibility, we undertake to do all we can to enlighten public opinion on the dangers of war and on the urgent need for disarmament. We hope that the various trends of opinion for peace will be able to co-ordinate their efforts in the defence and preservation of mankind.

We propose to convene a larger conference on the same theme, to which will be invited people drawn from intellectuals, trade unions, the Churches, Science and from a wide range of political opinion.

The list of those present when the statements were agreed is:

H. Siradjuddin Abbas (Indonesia), **Baron A. Allard** (Belgium), **Gunther**

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Anders (Austria), **Geoffrey Barraclough** (Great Britain), **Professor J. D. Bernal** (Great Britain), **Madame Isabelle Blume** (Belgium), **Heinrich Buchbinder** (Switzerland), **Oleg Bykov** (U.S.S.R.), **Dr. Henry J. Cadbury** (U.S.A.), **Mrs. Diana Collins** (Great Britain), **Canon L. John Collins** (Great Britain), **Maurice Cosyn** (Belgium), **Madame Eugenie Cotton** (France), **John Darr, Jr.** (U.S.A.), **The Reverend Alfred Dickie** (Australia), **Ostap Dluski** (Poland), **Ilya Ehrenburg** (U.S.S.R.), **Mrs. Marion Faninacci** (Italy), **Rabbi Abraham L. Feinberg** (Canada), **Dr. Erich Fromm** (U.S.A.), **Edouard Le Ghait** (Belgium), **Professor L. C. B. Gower** (Great Britain), **Jacquetta Hawkes** (Great Britain), **Professor Josef Hromadka** (Czechoslovakia), **Dr. Homer Jack** (U.S.A.), **Francis Jude** (Great Britain), **Robert Jungk** (Austria), **Aminu Kano, M.P.** (Nigeria), **Dr. Heinz Kloppenburg** (German Federal Republic), **Alexander Korneichuk** (U.S.S.R.), **Professor D. D. Kosambi** (India), **Diwan Chaman Lall, M.P.** (India), **Professor F. Lieb** (Switzerland), **Lucio Luzzatto** (Italy), **Kingsley Martin** (Great Britain), **Ivor Montagu** (Great Britain), **Edita Morris** (Sweden), **Ira Morris** (U.S.A.), **The Reverend A. J. Muste** (U.S.A.), **Jayaprakash Narayan** (India), **Mrs. Ava Pauling** (U.S.A.), **Professor Linus Pauling** (U.S.A.), **Miss Orlie Pell** (U.S.A.), **Dr. Antoinette Pirie** (Great Britain), **Darrell Randall** (U.S.A.), **Archbishop T. D. Roberts** (Great Britain), **Ernie Roberts** (Great Britain), **Senator Velio Spano** (Italy), **Professor Ivan Supek** (Yugoslavia), **Bertil Svahnstrom** (Sweden), **Arpad Szakasits** (Hungary), **Oliver Tambo** (South Africa), **Professor A. N. Tucker** (Great Britain), **Max Winiger** (Switzerland), **Dr. Hugh Wolfe** (U.S.A.).

BOOKS

[*With his latest play* LUTHER, *John Osborne has carried forward his deepening dramatic development (examined at a previous stage in* Labour Monthly, *March,* 1958, *pp.* 101-104) *from the early relatively limited* LOOK BACK IN ANGER *to the richer canvas of* THE ENTERTAINER, *and now, through the very much deeper-cutting* WORLD OF PAUL SLICKEY—*which proved too strong meat for the conventional critics—to a historical tragedy, wherein the individualist rebel is exposed against the background of class society and the living class struggle in relation to which he is finally revealed on the side of reaction. We have pleasure in printing a review of this important play by the well-known historian and authority on the Reformation, Archibald Robertson.* —*Ed.,* L.M.]

Luther
John Osborne
Faber & Faber. 102pp. 10s. 6d.

IN THIS SHORT PLAY John Osborne turns away from the angry young men of our own day to tell the story of a rather important 'angry' of the sixteenth century. In a series of effective scenes we see Martin Luther as a morbidly religious young man (the morbidity due in large measure to chronic constipation) burying himself in a monastery for the salvation of his soul, to the annoyance of his father, a practical man who has worked his way up

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

from a mining job into business. We see the angry and angular Martin unhappy in his religious life and at last, after an interview with his father, asking himself: 'But—but what if it isn't true?' He boils over when the fraud, John Tetzel, appears publicly hawking indulgences for the remission of sin and the replenishment of the papal exchequer. To the scandal of his superiors he nails to the church door at Wittenberg his theses against indulgences, and thereby throws down a challenge to the whole papal racket.

Not that Luther had done a new thing. For a century and more the rising bourgeoisie had been simmering with revolt against the papal racket. But the revolt now gathered such force that the lay princes of northern Europe, instead of repressing it, put themselves at its head. We are shown Pope Leo X exclaiming in alarm: 'There's a wild pig in our vineyard, and it must be hunted down and shot'. Easier said than done! Luther burns the Pope's Bull, and at the Diet of Worms refuses to recant with his famous, 'Here I stand; God help me; I can do no more'. As many German princes and all the burgher class are with him, he gets away with it. The tragedy comes when the south German peasants take Luther at his word and rise not only against the papal racket, but against the whole feudal system which it consecrated. Luther, the protègé of princes and rich burghers, eggs on the princes (not that they needed any egging) to massacre the rebel peasants, justifying himself by Paul's tirade against those who resisted Rome in his day. The curtain falls on Luther happily married to an ex-nun, and with a little son of his own, but so far as the movement of the world goes, still the spokesman of princes and burghers, and to the common people a lost leader.

ARCHIBALD ROBERTSON.

Selected Stories of Lu Hsun

Foreign Languages Press, Peking, and Central Books, London. 324pp. 7s. 6d.

IF you want to know, as though you had experienced it yourself, the effect of decadent feudalism and foreign colonial rule on the lives of ordinary folk, read these eighteen moving stories about Chinese people. Written between 1918 and 1926, a period of intense revolutionary ferment, these *Selected Stories* are part of the all-too-small literary legacy of Lu Hsun, who is known as the founder of China's socialist literature. Though at the time these were written Lu Hsun had not yet reached the clear political stand he later took up, his hatred for the rottenness of the ruling clique and his intense, agonising compassion for the poor and op-

CLASSIFIED ADVERTISEMENTS

(3s. 6d. a line, minimum, 10s. 6d. Cash with order to: 'Class. Ads.', Labour Monthly, 134, Ballards Lane, London, N.3.)

DUPLICATING, Verbatim Shorthand, Typing (tapes, etc.), Translating. Mabel Eyles, 10, Beaconsfield Road, London, N.11. ENT 3324.

VETERAN L.M. readers: your early copies and pamphlets may be invaluable to others. Send details to: L.M. Exchange Service, 134, Ballards Lane, London, N.3.

WE BUY books, pamphlets, Lab. Mvt., Spain, Russia, Comintern. We collect. The Hammersmith Bookshop, Beadon Road, W.6. RIV 6807.

FURS, COATS, stoles, capes, etc. Excellent range fine furs and styles. Buy now and save cash. Mimette Furs Ltd., 117, High Street, Croydon. CROydon 4328.

WANTED: T.U.C. REPORTS for the following years: 1868 to 1922 inclusive; 1924 to 1926. Also Labour Party Conference Reports before 1933; also 1935; 1938; 1948; and 1956. 'Labour Librarian', c/o *Labour Monthly*, 134, Ballards Lane, London, N.3.

URGENTLY REQUIRED—All back numbers of *Labour Monthly* from 1921-1930 inclusive and 1939.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

pressed made him distinguish between friend and foe in every class of society. He leaves us in no doubt as to where he stood: always on the side of the humble even when he most clearly shows their frailties, their bewilderment, their apparent stupidity; always contemptuous of the cowardly, the hypocritical and the corrupt among the middle class and the intellectuals even when he pities their weakness and confusion; always angrily antagonistic towards the arrogant, bloodsucking feudal hierarchy and its various henchmen. Lu Hsun's writing has very much the quality of traditional Chinese painting, its economy of line, its unerring choice of the significant detail, its ability to convey vast depths as much by what is left out as by what is put in. His stories seldom have a beginning, a middle and an end: they impale a human being for a brief moment of his life, bare him to our gaze, and leave us feeling that we have been impaled too, because we have met ourselves.

NAN GREEN.

History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union

Lawrence & Wishart. 766pp. 10s. 6d.

No political party has so profoundly influenced the course of world history as the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. Its triumphant building of socialism has brought nearer the realisation of mankind's long cherished dream of communist society and its role and achievements are of paramount importance for understanding what is happening in the world today. This new history, therefore, will be widely welcomed. This is an entirely new work and should not be confused with the old *Short History of the C.P.S.U.* which was published in 1937. The present book, which is the collective work of a group of prominent Soviet historians and specialists headed by B. N. Ponomaryov, covers a far longer period, going right up to the 21st Congress in 1959, so that two-thirds of it deal with the period after 1917. Not only is there far more detail, but the background, national and international, of events is fully treated. The English translation has been ably edited by A. F. Rothstein. Packed with information, it is not easy reading but as an authoritative work of reference is invaluable. In connection with the exciting and instructive history of the Communist Party's successful handling of the varied problems it had to face, the comprehensive treatment involves a survey of international politics at each stage and a study of the problems that every country has to face in building socialism and advancing to communism. Above all it provides a veritable encyclopaedia of Marxist-Leninist theory as exemplified in action. The Communist Party does not stand still but continually solves new problems on the basis of Marxist-Leninist theory and at the same time enriches the theory by its experience. It is appropriate that this book should appear this year when the 22nd Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union will be held, which will mark a further stage in the transition from Socialism to Communism and formulate the new programme of the party on this basis.

CLEMENS DUTT.

Published by the proprietors, The Trinity Trust, 134, Ballards Lane, London, N.3, and printed by Wembley News, Wembley, Middlesex, Great Britain. Registered for transmission by Magazine Post to Canada, including Newfoundland.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(*Continued from page ii of cover*)

pressed he was, reading it ever since 1935, with how correct are its predictions; how it helped him understand the 'issues behind the Spanish war, the phoney war period, the Finnish war, and so on. I'm taking out a sub for my son; as a teacher he is now in the firing line'. A circular about our September issue reached a *London engineering* shop steward: 'I showed it to two leading Labour Party stewards and we agreed to take a dozen copies to sell to other stewards in view of the very topical articles.' Another in *Manchester*, writing to check a reference about which there had been argument, added: '*L.M.* gets better as it gets older; I sell 20 copies at my factory and they all look forward to it.' A *Scottish railwayman*, busy in trade union and Labour Party affairs, snatches time for a hurried word with his donation: 'It's needed here more than ever.' A *London tube-train driver*, 'onetime member of a tank crew', remarks that without it he would 'feel more than left high and dry by events. But they are really moving in favour of humanity and not back to Hitlerite darkness, as you might believe if you only read the capitalist papers.' A *Newcastle* woman feels it particularly applies to her, that *L.M.* is said to be written for those 'too busy to read', as she 'doesn't find time to read nearly enough'—and so finds *L.M.* a very useful time-saver. A gift from a distinguished *American professor*, who hopes that it 'may live long after England has become socialist . . . yes, long after U.S.A. has returned to commonsense, whichever happens last!'

Meanwhile the way readers back appreciation with financial support is an ever-present cause for pride and satisfaction. Observe the birthday gifts for this 40th year, already well over £500. Donations received during August totalled:

£116 3s. 10d.

40th BIRTHDAY PRESENTS came from: T. Southern, £1 2s; 'Daisy Bell', £10; Afro-Asian Friends of Labour Monthly, £33 7s 6d; 'Alderman', £18 2s 6d. (BIRTHDAY TOTAL NOW STANDS AT: £541 9s.)

REGULAR DONATIONS came from: C.T.H., £4; R. McLeod, 10s; 'In Memory of Joe Brien', 3s; H.G.B., 10s; J. A. Smith, 12s; 'Backslider', 10s; The Humphreys Family, 5s; R.F.B., £3; E. Strachen Rogers, £2 2s; L'Humanite, 4s; 'Anon', Whitchurch, 1s; L. Perkins, 2s 6d; 'Windfall', £10; R. Dodd, £2; L. Bates, 5s; Blackburn Branch, 1s; Oldham Branch, 1s; 'Oliver Twist' and Friends, 15s; F.G.A. (Canada), 10s; S. Morrissy, 10s; M. Illing, 10s; E.J.B., 10s; J. Purton, 7s 6d; 'Socialist Sailor', £1; A.M.T., for Fernando and Guilherme, Portugal, 1s.

OTHER CONTRIBUTIONS INCLUDE: L. Cooper, 2s 6d; W. Savage, 2s; J. J. Murphy, £2; W. Davidson, 5s; M. Darby, 2s; R. J. Willers, 7s; J. Peterson, 12s; J.M. (Australia), £2; H. S. Richards, £5; P. Leplar, £1; K. Forge, 10s; E. S. Williams, £1; A. W. Wales, 2s 6d; J. Hodgson, 10s; A. Wills, 12s; A. Perkins, £1 2s; E. Bennett, 2s 6d; F. and F.B., 10s; Finchley C.N.D., 8s 9d; R. Herring, 2s 6d; J. McLanachan, £1; O. M. Ford, 2s; H.C.S., 14s; G.H. (Canada), 7s 1d; J. Hall, 2s; Constance Eggleton, 6s 6d; B. W. Mackay, 3s; A. Hampton, 10s; 'Northern Line Driver', 5s; A. W. Elliott, 3s; E. and G. Bestford, 5s; I. R. Innes, £1; J. Dobson, £2; D. K. Flinn, 'In memory of Joan, who like Joe Hill and all "the fighters", lives on', £1; C.H. (Canada), 13s 6d.

Our thanks to you all.

Co-op. No. L.99482.

ANGELA TUCKETT,
134, Ballards Lane, London, N.3.
FINchley 5135.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Binder Bros. Ltd.

Building and decorating
by craftsmen

STAmford Hill 4096

FORUM ON FREEDOM

Speakers: Canon E. Carpenter of Westminster Abbey, Vice Chairman of C.N.D.
John Gollan, Editor of *Marxism Today*
On Monday, 13 November. 7.30
Friends Meeting House, Euston Road.
Organised by *Marxism Today*, 16, King St., W.C.2
Admission 1/6

LABOUR RESEARCH

Planning—For What?
U.K. Investment in Common Market
Cut-price Oil

price 1s. 2d. post free
Labour Research Department
161, Drury Lane, London, W.C.2

40th ANNIVERSARY SOUVENIR PAMPHLET

•

Storming Heaven

By R. Palme Dutt

Special limited edition
numbered 1 to 500
of May notes with Commune,
William Blake, illustrations.

16 pp. Price 1s.

Order now from
LABOUR MONTHLY
134, Ballards Lane, London, N.3

WHY NOT BY POST?

NAME .....
(Please use block capitals)

ADDRESS .....

.....

I enclose 18s. (if by wrapper, or £1 if by envelope), for year's subscription from the.....issue

(SIGNED).....

To LABOUR MONTHLY
134, BALLARDS LANE, LONDON, N.3

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED